

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 19-1688C  
(Filed: November 13, 2019)

\*\*\*\*\*  
YOLANDA DENISE THOMPSON, \*  
\*  
Plaintiff, \*  
\*  
v. \* Pro Se Plaintiff; Jurisdiction; Sua Sponte  
\* Dismissal  
\*  
THE UNITED STATES, \*  
\*  
Defendant. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Yolanda Denise Thompson, Philadelphia, PA, pro se.

## OPINION AND ORDER

SWEENEY, Chief Judge

This case arises out of pro se plaintiff Yolanda Denise Thompson’s complaint concerning her ongoing criminal case and related bail conditions. Specifically, Ms. Thompson alleges that she cannot be subject to criminal prosecution because those involved in the case lack authority to prosecute or adjudicate the charges against her, and their insistence on doing so while subjecting her to bail conditions has resulted in a variety of compensable wrongs. The court, for the reasons discussed below, dismisses the complaint for lack of jurisdiction sua sponte.

### I. BACKGROUND

On March 29, 2018, a grand jury in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania returned a nine-count indictment with respect to Ms. Thompson.<sup>1</sup> Specifically, the grand jury alleged that Ms. Thompson (1) conspired to defraud the United States by submitting fraudulent documents to the United States Internal Revenue Service and (2) aided and abetted in the preparation of fraudulent federal income tax returns. Ms. Thompson was arrested on July 25, 2018, and detained until her arraignment on August 2, 2018. During Ms. Thompson’s arraignment in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (“District Court”), she was released on bail and ordered to, among other things, attend mental health services, submit to GPS

---

<sup>1</sup> The facts in this section are derived from the complaint (including attached exhibits), and matters of which the court may take judicial notice pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence. See Rocky Mountain Helium, LLC v. United States, 841 F.3d 1320, 1325-26 (Fed. Cir. 2016).

monitoring, surrender her passport, remain in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, stay in her home (except in limited circumstances), and refrain from preparing any tax returns without prior approval. While free on bail, she is being supervised by the United States Pretrial Services for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

In her complaint, Ms. Thompson alleges that she never authorized those involved with her criminal case—who she calls “Traffickers” and identifies as federal prosecutors, federal judges, and others—to prosecute her or adjudicate charges against her.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, she states that “Traffickers are acting without authority or consent from [Ms. Thompson] . . . .” Compl. 3; accord *id.* at 4 (explaining that the “Traffickers are without authority to act as Attorney in Fact for [Ms. Thompson]” and “are committing fraud, identity theft, and trafficking of persons without [her] consent”). She also alleges that the Traffickers, by illegally prosecuting and restricting her freedom, are violating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (“UDHR”). Additionally, she avers that

[b]y intentional unjust conviction and imprisonment, Human trafficking in Person by force, fraud and coercion, isolating, enticing, transporting, holding, confining, harboring, profiting, soliciting, depriving liberty, threatening legal actions, psychological control, financial threats, legal harassment, withholding passport, threatening force, debt bondage, causing financial harm, kidnapping and abduction, abusing position of power . . . .

*Id.* at 11. She proceeds to state that government actors have committed or caused “intentional fraud, theft, battery, assault, financial losses, misrepresentation, false imprisonment, emotional infliction of mental distress, trespassing to land, trespassing to chattel and conversion and duress against [her] since the age of majority.” *Id.* at 13. The court refers collectively to the purported wrongs identified in the prior two sentences as “Improper Conduct.” Ms. Thompson concludes by requesting that the court (1) dismiss all of the cases against her for lack of jurisdiction, (2) release her immediately (apparently from her bail conditions given that she is not imprisoned), and (3) award her \$10 billion for the Improper Conduct.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Ms. Thompson’s complaint is replete with confusing statements that seemingly reflect concepts grounded in ideas espoused by Moorish sovereign citizens or similar movements. For example, she refers to herself as a trustee for “YOLANDA DENISE THOMPSON, [Personal Member Association],” Compl. 2, which is typical of sovereign citizens, see *Bey v. State*, 847 F.3d 559, 560-61 (7th Cir. 2017) (“Many sovereign citizen organizations teach that whenever a Moor’s name is spelled in capital letters in a government document, the name identifies not the individual but instead his ‘corporate shell identity’ . . . .”). Although it is difficult to discern what Ms. Thompson is attempting to convey in the portions of the complaint that are more heavily steeped in sovereign citizen concepts, the court can parse the crux of the allegations and claims.

<sup>3</sup> Ms. Thompson also requests that Albert Upshur—an individual who the aforementioned grand jury indicted for the same conduct as Ms. Thompson—receive the same relief. Mr. Upshur, however, is not a plaintiff in this case.